

# The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## Some Notes on the Historical Poems of George of Pisidia

Norman H. Baynes

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 6 / Issue 02 / April 1912, pp 82 - 90  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800021947, Published online: 11 February 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009838800021947](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800021947)

### How to cite this article:

Norman H. Baynes (1912). Some Notes on the Historical Poems of George of Pisidia. The Classical Quarterly, 6, pp 82-90 doi:10.1017/S0009838800021947

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## SOME NOTES ON THE HISTORICAL POEMS OF GEORGE OF PISIDIA.

(i.) EVEN after the masterly studies of Leo Sternbach following on the paper by Hilberg<sup>1</sup> there are still some small points to be noted on the historical poems of George of Pisidia. In what follows I have, of course, presupposed a knowledge of Sternbach's work which has happily rendered superfluous the new text which he was to have edited for Methuen's Series of Byzantine Texts.

*Exph. Pers. Acr. I 73-75.*

πλὴν ἐξ ἀνάγκης· οὐ γὰρ ἦψατο χρόνου  
δείξαντος ἀνδρίας τε καὶ φρονήσεως  
καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐταῖς κοινὸν οἰκητήριον.

Homer in his poems had divided the active and the contemplative virtues, attributing them to different personalities : and necessarily so, says George, for the reason given above. Quercius has, however, misunderstood the poet, for he translates : 'Non enim attigit quod postea tempus edocuit fortitudini et prudentiae cognatisque uirtutibus commune esse domicilium.' This is to turn a compliment into a platitude ; the meaning is that Homer had not lived to see a day which had produced a man—the Emperor Heraclius—who in his single person was the home of all the virtues—in whom thought and action had alike found their perfect expression.

ibid. 152.

Ἦδει γὰρ ἡμῶν τὸν συνήγορον λόγον  
πάντως παρῆναι τῆς δίκης κινουμένης.

So the common text. But V. and M. read ὑμῶν, and this Sternbach (*Rozprawy*, etc., p. 226, cf. p. 161 n.<sup>1</sup>) accepts as = Heraclius. But even this is, I think, unsatisfactory. George has previously been describing the sacred picture of Christ which Heraclius took with him when starting on his first Persian campaign—the (l. 40)

μορφὴν  
ἦν χεῖρες οὐκ ἔγραψαν ἀλλ' ἐν εἰκόνι  
ὁ πάντα μορφῶν καὶ διαπλάττων Λόγος  
ἄνευ γραφῆς μορφῶσιν (accent thus, not μόρφωσιν  
as in Migne) ὥς ἄνευ σποράς  
κύησιν αὐτὸς . . .

<sup>1</sup> Isidor Hilberg : 'Textkritische Beiträge zu Georgios Pisides,' *Wiener Studien* IX (1887), pp. 207-222. Leo Sternbach : 'Georgii Pisidae Carmina Inedita,' *Wiener Studien* XIII (1891), pp.

1-62, XIV (1892), pp. 51-68. Id : *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności. Wydział filologiczny. Serya II, Tom xv, Krakow, 1900*, pp. 365.

he proceeds (l. 50) :

τούτῳ πεποιθὼς τῷ θεογράφῳ τύπῳ  
θείαν ἀπαρχὴν τῶν ἀγώνων εἰργάσω

and then follow the lines cited above. We should read :

ἔδει γὰρ ὑμῖν τὸν συνήγορον Λόγον  
πάντως παρῆναι τῆς δίκης κινουμένης.

In the great trial of right between the rival empires which was just beginning the Christian Emperor needed the Holy Word to be his Advocate.

ibid. 226. For ἐκκοπήν read ἐγκοπήν, which, despite the authority of M. and V., Sternbach approves in *Exp. Pers. Acr.* II 8, as there read by *p* and Bekker (see Sternbach, *Rozprawy*, etc., p. 201 n.<sup>6</sup>).

*Exp. Pers. Acr.* II 92-97. Quercius in his Latin translation has lost the point of this passage: the contrast lies between ταῖς ἀπανθρώποις βίαις of v. 92 and ταῖς ἀνάγκαις ταῖς ἀνεγκλήτοις of v. 96. It is with armed violence that the tyrant sets at naught the laws: it is by the blameless compulsion of George's untranslatable φιλάνθρωπος βία that the true sovereign tempers with mercy the harshness of the strict letter of the law.

ibid. 138 sqq. καὶ συρραγέντων τῶν στρατευμάτων ὅλων  
ξίφος μὲν ἀσπίς καὶ ξίφη τὰς ἀσπίδας  
ὥθουν βιαίῳ πανταχοῦ συγκρούσμασι,  
141. καὶ μεστὰ πολλῶν αἱμάτων τὰ φάσγανα  
ὁ σχηματισμὸς τῆς τέχνης ἐδείκνυε,  
καὶ πάντα φρικτὰ καὶ φόβος καὶ σύγχυσις  
144. καὶ πρὸς φόνους σύννευσις αἱμάτων δίχα.

These lines describe peaceful military manoeuvres. To me line 141 seems extraordinarily harsh in conjunction with l. 144, even if it can be made to render any sense at all. The repeated καί of lines 143 and 144 has caught the eye of the scribe. Line 141 should read :

ὥς μεστὰ πολλῶν αἱμάτων τὰ φάσγανα

and a full stop should be placed after συγκρούσμασι.

ibid. 181. I have, says George, already told

ὥς οὐδὲν ἡμέλησας, ἀλλὰ καὶ γράφων  
τοῖς σοῖς στρατηγοῖς πανταχοῦ τὸ σύμφερον  
ἤμαρτες οὐδέν, εἴπερ ἐν δεόντι γε  
τό σοι παραστὰν εὐθέως συνέδραμεν . . .

The lines describe the preparations of Heraclius for the first campaign. They are thus punctuated in the Bonn edition, and are translated, 'praenuntiaui . . . te nihil neglexisse; sed etiam praescribens tuis ubique ducibus quod conduceret neutiquam aberrasti: si quid enim factu opus fuit promptum ac paratum illico tibi succurrit.' This is, I think, wrong. Place a colon after οὐδέν, a comma after γε, and translate εἴπερ, etc. 'Although help

came late and our need was sore, yet the forces under thy command sped swiftly to the meeting-place.'

ibid. 185. Read ἐντεῦθεν ἡμᾶς οὐ ταράττουσιν φόβοι (metri causa).

ibid. 232. A Saracen serving on the Persian side has been captured by Heraclius and, freed by him, changes his allegiance and joins the Roman forces.

πολλὴν δὲ θάττον τὴν ἐναλλαγὴν βλέπων  
ἀντιστροφὴν ἔκρινε τὴν σωτηρίαν.

cf. *Her.* I. 127. εὐτολμίαν ἔδειξε τὴν ἀτολμίαν, *Her.* II. 224. ἔχει δὲ τιμὴν τὴν καλὴν ἀτιμίαν, and esp. *Exr. Pers.* III. 292. ἔκρινεν εἶναι τὴν φυγὴν σωτηρίαν.

So read here : σωτηρίαν ἔκρινε τὴν ἀντιστροφὴν.

ibid. 242-3. Sternbach's conjecture (*Rozprawy*, etc., p. 167 n.<sup>5</sup>) ἔκτοπον is unnecessary, but perhaps we should read ἡρεθισμένων (l. 243) in place of ἡρεθισμένην.

ibid. 257. συντόμως ὁ βάρβαρος  
τὰς εἰσβολὰς κατέσχε τῆς ὁδοῦ φθάσας.

Read συντόμως: a favourite word of George of Pisidia (cf. *Exr. Pers.* I 171, II 154, Sternbach, *Rozprawy*, etc., p. 214). The occupation of the passes was indeed so complete that Heraclius could only continue his march by means of a stratagem.<sup>1</sup>

*Exr. Pers.* III 27. Read προσκατέτρεχεν (metri causa).

ibid. 35. ἔπηξεν αὐτοῦ σὺν φόβῳ τὰ τάγματα.

Sternbach (*Rozprawy*, etc., p. 10) is probably right in conjecturing αὐτοῦ: but may αὐτοῦ here be an adverb?

ibid. 76. μίαν γὰρ ἢ τρέχουσα πανταχοῦ δίκην  
τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους οὐ παρήκεν ἡμέραν.

Read τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις. I take the meaning to be: 'Justice did not concede to the barbarians the respite of a single day.'

ibid. 143. ἐρῶ δὲ πᾶσαν τοῦ σκοποῦ τὴν αἰτίαν. 'I will relate in full the origin of the Persian plot.' Since George has just said (l. 137)

πλὴν οὐ προσήκει συγκαλύψαι τῷ λόγῳ  
τὸ Περσικὸν κάλυμμα τῆς πανουργίας

it is tempting to propose τοῦ σκότου (cf. Plato, *Legg.* 864c σκότος used with ἀπατή in the sense of 'deceit'). But probably σκοπός in George has the meaning of 'plot' or 'artifice.' Cf. *Exr. Pers.* II 274:

οὕτω στρατηγῶν καὶ σοφὴν πλαστοουργίαν  
μόνος κατορθοῖς καὶ σοφὴν ὑπόκρισιν,  
καὶ τοῦτο μᾶλλον τοῦ σκοποῦ τὸ ποικίλον  
τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐνήκεν εἰς ῥαθυμίαν.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. N. H. Baynes: 'The First Campaign of Heraclius against Persia,' *E.H.R.* xix. (1904), pp. 694-702.

ibid. 189. τὴν ἐκλογὴν δὲ σοῦ στρατοῦ συναρμόσας

Read τοῦ στρατοῦ: the accepted reading makes the whole passage unintelligible.

ibid. 229. ἐπεὶ δὲ καὐτοὺς εἶδεν ἐπτοημένους  
καὶ συντόνως πίπτοντας ἀσχήτω φόβῳ κ.τ.λ.

Read συντόμως: the Persians were not 'falling with a will,' but sorely against their inclinations.

ibid. 281 etc. Sternbach, *Rozprawy*, etc., p. 23, writes of these lines: 'Theophanes falso ad Persarum tentoria transtulit.' I cannot help feeling that Theophanes understood his author better than the modern critic (cf. *E.H.R.* xix [1904], p. 702 n.<sup>46</sup>).

ibid. p. 297. Retain the MS. reading. Sternbach's (*Rozprawy*, etc., p. 23) 'Ῥωμαῖφ ξίφει is unnecessary. In face of *De Bell. Anar.* 39 τοῦ δὲ Ῥωμαίων κράτους, the βάρβαρον ξίφος of *Exp. Pers.* II 112, *De Bell. Anar.* 332 is insufficient to justify emendation.

ibid. 349. νῦν γὰρ τὰ Περσῶν τῆς πλάνης μυστήρια  
γυμνὰ πρόεισιν· ἄρτι τῆς κεκρυμμένης  
ὑδρας παρ' αὐτοῖς ἡ πολυκέφαλος πλάνη  
ἔνα προτείνειν ἀξιοῖ τὸν ἀνχένα  
ὃν νῦν βλέποντες εἰσάγαν (edd. MSS. have εἰς ἄγαν :  
rightly. Cf. Sternbach *Rozprawy*, etc., p.  
109 n<sup>2</sup>) θαυμάζομεν  
Ἡρακλέος τυχόντα καὶ σεσωσμένον.  
οἶμαι δὲ καὐτὸν αἰχμάλωτον ἐν τάχει  
ὄψει δεθέντα τὸν δράκοντα Χοσρόην  
εἰ μὴ λάβοι τις τὴν δίκην ὑποψίαν  
ὥς εἴπερ ὑμῖν ἐκδοθῇ τὰς ἀξίας  
λάθοι παρελθὼν ἐν βραχεὶ τιμωρίας.

A passage of very great difficulty. The interpretation given to it by Quercius, and the only one known to me, is as follows: 'Hic alludit ad Seuerianorum haeresim quae tot turbas excitauit in Oriente et Heraclio imperante adhuc uigebat. Idcirco autem dicit esse detecta mysteria iniquitatis quod Heraclius . . . hoc primo in Oriente itinere aperte deprehendit errores circa religionem inter Christianos disseminari a Persis ut Romani inter se dissentientes nouum Heraclio facerent negotium et Romanorum imperium non tantum externis quam internis premeretur incommodis. . . . Multiplex error uel hydra erat haeresis Manetis quae ex Persarum deliramentis orta et late propagata uarios uidit aspectus sub Manete primum ipso, deinde sub Eutyche, demum sub Seuero et aliis innumeris eorundem asseclis. At nunc Pisida hanc hydram unam tantum ait protendere ceruicem, scilicet errorem Monophysitarum, Chosroa uires et animum suppeditante. vv. 353 sqq.: hinc uidetur posse coniici Heraclium in Armenia degentem cum aliquo doctore

Monophysita coram Pisida disputasse; ac praeterea Pisidam dicere se mirari hoc hydrae collum non esse exsectum postquam in Herculem id est Heraclium inciderat. Hunc autem doctorem fuisse Paulum Seuerianum quocum Heraclius disputavit in partibus Armeniae . . . alibi probabimus.'

Despite the extreme ingenuity of this explanation it must, I think, be rejected. The passage comes at the end of a poem celebrating the military triumph of the first campaign, and contains no other references to religious differences amongst the Christians themselves. We must seek a simpler solution. The hidden hydra is only another name for the δράκων of v. 356 and of the *Carmina Inedita* II 21-22, *Wiener Studien* XIII, 1891, p. 5, or the Gorgon of *Heracliad* II 81 and 89, and all = Chosroes. This is proved by the parallel passage *Heracl.* I 67-92, where the poet adjures his readers to admire the conqueror of Persia τὸν κοσμορύστην Ἡρακλέα who (vv. 74-75)

ἀνείλε τὸν δράκοντα τὸν μιαῖφονον  
καθεῖλεν ὕδραν μυριαύχενον βλαβήν.

ἡ πολυκέφαλος πλάνη is thus the whole false system of Persia (cf. parallels in note <sup>1</sup>). The single neck which the hydra dares to put forth is then Sahrbarâz, whose defeat is the subject of the poem: though discomfited, he is not destroyed.<sup>2</sup> But with line 357 there are further difficulties—εἰ μὴ λάβοι τις τὴν δίκην ὑποψίαν. Quercius' note is 'τὴν δίκην subaudi κατά,' but, as Sternbach remarks (*Rozprávky*, etc., p. 114 n.<sup>1</sup>), George, had he meant this, would have written ἐνδίκως or εἰκότως. Sternbach conjectures τῆς δίκης, and considers that the poet is expressing his fear that the appeal of Chosroes to the clemency of Heraclius may be only too successful (cf. *Exp. Pers.* II 217 sqq.). I think that the error lies rather in ὑποψίαν, and, as at least showing my conception of the poet's meaning, would suggest αὐτουργίαν<sup>3</sup>—such explanatory accusatives occur in George of Pisidia (or ? αὐτουργία)—followed by a fullstop. 'I think that we shall soon see even Chosroes himself a prisoner and in chains, that is unless some other anticipates us and wreaks his vengeance on him with his own hand. If only ultimately Chosroes is delivered up to you (the Emperor) my wish is that albeit hard bestead (ἐν βραχεῖ) he may yet escape such

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Exp. Pers.* I 21 sqq., *Exp. Pers.* II 239 sqq.: καὶ ταῦτα μὲν σοι (Heraclius) σωφρόνως ἐπράττετο | τῷ δὲ στρατηγῷ τῆς πλάνης τάναντία κ.τ.λ. *Exp. Pers.* III 9 of Heraclius: καὶ Φοῖβος ἡμῖν εὐσεβὴς προέρχεται | πάντας καθαίρων ἐκ καθαροῦ λόγου | τοῦ Λοξίου δὲ τοὺς ὄρους βδελύττεται | τὰ στρεβλά φεύγων τῆς πλάνης αἰνίγματα in a contrast with the Persian faith. *Exp. Pers.* III 138, speaking of τὸ Περσικὸν κάλυμμα τῆς πανουργίας, George writes οἶδεν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἡ διδάσκαλος πλάνη | καὶ συμμαχούντας δεικνύειν ἀγνώμονας, | τὸ σύντροφον γὰρ τῆς κακουργίας ἔθος | αἰεὶ πάρ' αὐτοῖς εἰς νόμον μεθίσταται. And *Exp. Pers.* III 439 of the children of Heraclius when praying χεῖρας νέμοντες εὐσεβῶς ἠπλωμένους | ἐσταλμένους δὲ πρὸς το λήμμα τῆς πλάνης. Further cf. Theophanes 308<sup>5</sup>,

ed. de Boor, of the sacred fire ἡ πλάνη τῶν ἀνθρώπων which is from a lost verse of George of Pisidia.

<sup>2</sup> Though this was absolutely true, I cannot help feeling that in a panegyric of a successful Emperor, when the poet laureate proceeds to prophesy the fall of Chosroes himself as well as Sahrbarâz, this line is to say the least somewhat infelicitous, and I am tempted to suggest

Ἡρακλῆος τυχόντες καὶ σεσωσμένοι.

Now that they are safe the citizens can afford to wonder at the danger from which they have escaped.

<sup>3</sup> Used by George, *Exp. Pers.* I 199. For the poet's use of words formed from compounds of ἔργον cf. Sternbach, *Rozprávky*, etc., pp. 238-9.

punishment however well deserved.' The victim must fall not at the hand of a private citizen, but by the might of the Emperor.

*De Bello Auarico* v. 3. Perhaps γράφοι for γράφει.

ibid. 43. The earlier history of the troubles on the Danube has been written by others.

ὅσοις ἔδειξε συμπαρέρπων ὁ χρόνος  
τὴν τῶν φθασάντων ἀσφαλῶς ὑποψίαν.

ἀσφαλῶς with ἔδειξε: in pedestrian prose = 'who possessed through being contemporaries an accurate judgment in regard to events which are now past.' (For George's use of ὑποψία cf. Sternbach, *Rozprawy*, etc., pp. 114-5.)

ibid. v. 60. The νόσος of civil disorder.

πολλὰς ἐποίει τῶν μερῶν διαιρέσεις (inter-  
necine conflict of the demes)  
καὶ τοῖς ἑαυτοῖς αἵμασιν πεφυρμένον  
ὅλον τὸ σῶμα τοῖς πόνοις ἐβόσκετο.

This use of ἑαυτοῖς is awkward: perhaps read ἑαυτῶν: this would be rendered easier by the foregoing τῶν μερῶν.

ibid. 149. τεθειμένον: read τεθειμένην.

ibid. 184. Read πᾶσιν παρήνεις κ.τ.λ.

ibid. 202. Slav, Hun, Scyth, Bulgar and Persian in alliance against Constantinople

τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἡξιῶν ἀπιστίαν  
ἔχειν καθ' ἡμῶν πίστιν ἡκριβωμένην.

'Suamque ipsorum uolebant infidelitatem haberi a nobis loco fidei perspectissimae' is the Latin translation. A misunderstanding; it rather means 'they demanded of each other that their own ill-faith should turn as against us to mutual loyalty scrupulously observed.'

ibid. 229. τοσούτοις, read τοσούτους.

ibid. 245. Read εἶχεν κατ' ἐχθρῶν κ.τ.λ.

ibid. 250. Keep the MS. reading: Hilberg's τετραετῇ περίδρομον is wrong: the τρεῖς ἐτῶν περίδρομοι are the years 623-4-5. Heraclius began his second campaign against Persia in 623.

ibid. 338. Read τοῦτο δὴ δόξης χάριν κ.τ.λ.

ibid. 343. Read ἐξεφαύλισεν λόγοις.

ibid. 344. Read

συνέστρεφέν τε συλλαβὼν τῷ βαρβάρῳ  
γνώμας ἐνόπλους καὶ τεθηγμένους λόγους,

and correct the Latin translation. συλλαβῶν = 'acting in concert with.'

Heraclias I 11. βοᾷ λαλεῖ : perhaps βοῇ.

144. Read πύρωσις αὐτὴν ἀντανεῖλεν ἡλίου ;

148. οὐκ ἤρκεσάν σοι πρὸς τυράννους αἱ μάχαι  
οὐδ' ἡ παναλκῆς ἐξεπόρθησε κρίσις  
θᾶπτον λογισμοῦ καὶ σχεδὸν πρώτης τύχης  
εἰ πέρ τις ἔστι καὶ τυραννίδος τύχη.

I do not understand the meaning of πρώτη τύχη : is it possible that we should read πρώτη τύχης (for πρώτος with a genitive cf. L. and S. πρότερος B. I. 4. c.) ?

Heraclias II 62.

τούτῳ θέλοντες τῷ μεγίστῳ πράγματι  
μνήμην συνάψαι συμφερόντως ἢ πόλιν  
γράφουσιν ἡμῖν τῇ κάτωθεν εἰκόνι  
εἰ τὴν ἄνω γὰρ ἄλλων εἶχες ζωγράφον.

I suggest : γράφουσιν ὑμῖν (= the Emperor) τὴν κάτωθεν εἰκόνα,  
εἰς τὴν ἄνω γὰρ ἄλλον εἶχες ζωγράφον.

94. καὶ δὴ κατ' αὐτῆς ἀντιβάλλοντες βέλος κ.τ.λ.

Read ἀντιβάλλοντας. Without emendation the passage is unintelligible. I have endeavoured to justify this emendation at length in a paper on the date of the Avar surprise which will shortly appear in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*.

108 sqq. καὶ δὴ τὸ πρᾶγμα σχηματίζων ἐπλάσσω  
σαντὸν παρασχεῖν τοῖς πρὸ ἄστεως τόποις  
οὐχ ὥς τι τερπνόν, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ χρόνου  
χειμῶνος ὄντος, εὐπορεῖν εἰθισμένους.

V. has πρὸ ἄστεως : does this point to τοῖς προαστίοις τόποις (cf. Soph. *Fr.* 647) ? Sternbach conjectures εἰθισμένος : wrongly I think : read εἰθισμένους : one leaves the capital for pleasure in the summer and not in the winter.

205 sqq. καὶ πλαστὸν<sup>1</sup> αὐτοῖς σχηματουργήσας φόβον  
(φόνον γὰρ αὐτὸς οὐδὲ βαρβάρων θέλεις  
εἰ μὴ καθ' αὐτῶν ἐκσπάσονται<sup>1</sup> τὰ ξίφη)  
στήσας τε πολλὰς μηχανὰς τῶν ὀργάνων . . .

and generally beleaguering the town

ἄπαντας ἔνδον εἶλες ἐκ μόνου φόβου.

I think in line 205 we should read φόνον. Heraclius wanted to produce *real fear* by a simulated intention to *massacre* the inhabitants. The γάρ of 206 explains πλαστὸν and σχηματουργήσας.

<sup>1</sup> πλαστὸν e conj. Sternbach, *Rozprawy*, etc., p. 21 n.<sup>4</sup> Cf. Exp. Pers. II 262, Her. II 108. ἐκσπᾶσ. e conj. Sternbach *ibid.*, p. 246.



(ii.) I should be much interested if any student could furnish any clue as to the ἑνοπλος ἵππος worshipped in Persia, *Exp. Pers.* I 24, or as to the significance of the reference to the Celtic Rhine in *Exp. Pers.* I 41.

Two other notes may find a place here:

(iii.) Suidas sub uoc. Ἡράκλειος writes (ed. Bernhardt, Halle, etc., 1853)  
 . . . καὶ Κωνσταντῖνον υἱὸν αὐτοῦ παρασκευάζει ὑπατεῦσαι Ἡράκλειόν τε τὸν ἀπὸ Μαρτίνης Καίσαρα προχειρίζεται. πυθόμενος δὲ ἀποθανεῖν ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὰ Ἡρια παλατίοις διέτριβε. καὶ συναγαγὼν ὁ ὑπαρχος καὶ συζεύξας πλοῖα ἐπὶ τὸν πορθμὸν τοῦ καλουμένου Στενοῦ διέβη κατὰ τὰς ἀκτὰς τοῦ καλουμένου κόλπου Φειδαλίας καὶ διὰ τῆς γεφύρας τῆς Βαρυβύσσου ποταμοῦ εἰς τὴν πόλιν εἰσῆει. ὑδέρφ δὲ τὸν βίον καταστρέφει.

As to this return of the Emperor Heraclius from Syria we have full information in Nicephorus, pp. 25-26 (ed. de Boor, Leipsic, 1880), but what is the meaning of the obscure πυθόμενος δὲ ἀποθανεῖν in the extract of Suidas? We may, I think, gain some help from Glycas: in his history of the reign of Basil I (Glycas, p. 550, Bonn ed.) we find the following interesting paragraph:—

πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα καινουργήσας ὁ Βασίλειος καὶ κίνστερναν ἀπεκάθηρέ τινα ἦν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡράκλειος ἀπέχωσε κῆπον αὐτὴν ποιήσας λαχάνων. τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίησε καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὔσαις ἐντὸς τοῦ παλατίου τῇ τε πρὸς τῆς Μανναύρας καὶ τῇ μεταξὺ Ἰουστινιανοῦ καὶ τοῦ Λαυσακοῦ. ὁ γὰρ Ἡράκλειος παρὰ Στεφάνου τοῦ φιλοσόφου τὴν γένεσιν αὐτοῦ πολυπραγμονήσαντος μαθὼν ὡς ἐξ ὕδατος αὐτὸν ἀνάγκη τελευτᾶν τὰς τῶν κινστερνῶν ὡς εἴρηται προσχώσεις ἐποίησεν.

It is doubtless to this prophecy of Stephanus that Suidas refers.<sup>1</sup> A mention of this philosopher is to be found in the *Chronicle of Agapius*, the text of which is for the period of Heraclius as yet unedited. Baron von Rosen, however, published in 1884 large extracts in a Russian translation in the *Journal of the Ministry of Public Enlightenment*, and in this we read<sup>2</sup> that 'At that time (=628-629 A.D.) among the philosophers Stephan became famous: he was an Egypto-Alexandrian sage and the disciple of A-r-sâ-d-r-sa the philosopher and of Theodore the philosopher in Constantinople.' These passages add a little to our knowledge of the remarkable man who 'ingrauescente barbarie postremus ueterum scholae mathematicae Alexandrinae famam sustentauit.'<sup>3</sup>

(iv.) Theophylactus Simocatta, when describing the division of the Roman forces by Philippicus in the spring of 587 A.D., writes (II 10.6) according to the best MS. = *Vaticanus Graec.* 977 (see the preface to de Boor's edition, Leipsic, 1887, pp. vi sqq.):—ἐδίδου ὁ στρατηγὸς τὰς μὲν δύο μοῖρας τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς πάσης δυνάμεως

<sup>1</sup> Stephanus, it is recorded, ventured on a prophecy, which events falsified, as to the duration of the Mohammedan power. As to this cf. Cedrenus I, p. 717. 7, and H. Usener: *De Stephano Alexandrino Commentatio*, Bonn, 1880, pp. 8 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> Baron von Rosen: 'Zamyetki o Lyetopisi Agapiya Manbidzhskago,' *Zhurnal Ministerstva*

*Narodnago Prosvyeshcheniya*, part ccxxxi., 1884, February, pp. 47-75; and on Agapius cf. A. Vasiliev: 'Agapy, Manbidzhsky Khristiansky arabsky Istorik X. Vyeka,' *Vizantuiscky Vremmenik* XI. (1904), pp. 574-587.

<sup>3</sup> Usener, op. cit., p. 3. Cf. K. Krumbacher: *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2nd ed., Munich, 1897, pp. 430, 614, 621.

Ἡρακλείῳ (the father of the Emperor) . . . τὸν δὲ ἄτερον ἀποδασμὸν Θεοδώρῳ τῷ του (sine accentu) ῥαβδηνῶ καὶ Ἀνδρεᾷ κ.τ.λ. De Boor's critical note is as follows: τῷ Ἀβδηνῷ vulg. τῷ Ἀδηνῷ B. [= I. Bekker, Bonn ed., 1834]. Legerit Theophyl. in fonte suo Θεόδωρος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ Πάβδιος ὀρμώμενος uel simile quid (cf. Joh. Epiphan. *F.H.G.* iv. 274, Müller) et τουράβδιος nomen oppidi esse falso crediderit' (De Boor, p. 89). Bury, in his *History of the Later Roman Empire* (London, 1889), II p. 108 n.<sup>1</sup>, adopts this suggestion and adds: 'It is even possible that του may be due to a dittography of τῷ.' But I think that neither Theophylactus nor the scribe of V. was in error: Τουραβδηνός in fact = 'of Tur-'Abdîn,' the well-known district about Mount Izala, and we should keep the MS. reading and should emend Joh. Epiphan., loc. cit., into Τουράβδιος. For the literature on the Tur-'Abdîn cf. H. Gelzer, *Georgii Cyprii Descriptio Orbis Romani*, Leipsic, 1890, p. 157, and Max von Berchem and J. Strzygowski's *Amida*, containing 'The Churches and Monasteries of the Tur Abdin,' by Gertrude Lowthian Bell, Heidelberg, 1910.

NORMAN H. BAYNES.

NORTHWOOD, MIDDLESEX.